

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 SEAN PERRYMAN,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 RHINO ROOM, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

Case No. C17-0274RSL

ORDER

13
14 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's request for clarification regarding the
15 scope of relevant inquiry in this matter. Dkt. # 97. The video recordings are not the only type of
16 admissible evidence regarding what happened outside the Rhino Room on April 4, 2015, nor are
17 they unambiguous regarding certain events or the participants' motivations and justifications for
18 their actions. Plaintiff's claims are not, as he would have it, merely assertions that particular
19 events did or did not happen. His claims, as articulated in his complaint, are that Rhino Room
20 personnel and Justin Ismael assaulted him and knowingly made false statements to the police for
21 the purpose of having plaintiff arrested. These claims involve specific elements which plaintiff
22 must prove at trial and are subject to certain defenses which defendants may be able to prove at
23 trial. The parties may inquire about anything that is likely to produce admissible testimony or
24 evidence regarding these claims and defenses. No further clarification is warranted or possible.
25
26

ORDER

1 Dated this 25th day of January, 2018.

2
3 Robert S. Lasnik
4 Robert S. Lasnik
5 United States District Judge
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26